

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/664,972	09/22/2003	Hong Sung Song	8733.893.00	4974	
30827	7590 03/09/2006		EXAMINER		
	LONG & ALDRIDO	LUI, DONNA V			
1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2675		

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application No.		Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			10/664,972		SONG ET AL.				
			Examiner		Art Unit				
		Donna V. Lui		2675					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi r Reply	cation appe	ars on the cover sh	eet with the co	orrespondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MANSIONS OF time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comming period for reply is specified above, the maximum stare to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are departed term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DAT of 37 CFR 1.136 unication. Itutory period will will, by statute, c	TE OF THIS COMI (a). In no event, however, I apply and will expire SIX cause the application to be	MUNICATION , may a reply be time (6) MONTHS from to come ABANDONED	l, ely filed the mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>03 Jun</i>	ne 2005						
'=	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.								
/		cation is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.									
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· ·	Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)⊠	Claim(s) 1-25 are subject to restriction	on and/or el	ection requirement	Ł.					
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accep	pted or b)⊟ object	ed to by the E	Examiner.				
• ==	Applicant may not request that any object		• •	-					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	the correction	on is required if the d	rawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 Cl	FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Exa	miner. Note the at	tached Office	Action or form P1	ГО-152.			
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim t  ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	for foreign p	oriority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of	•	•		d in this National	Stage			
	application from the Internation		•	-	-l				
* 8	See the attached detailed Office action	n for a list o	the certified copie	s not receive	a.				
Attachmen									
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P	TO 049\		erview Summary ( per No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Inform	e of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (P mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date		5) 🔲 No		atent Application (PT	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/664,972

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-15, drawn to supplying a video signal to a liquid crystal display, classified in class 345, subclass 87.
  - II. Claims 16-25, drawn to a method of fabricating a liquid crystal display, classified in class 349, subclass 56.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process pertains to forming a plurality of gate electrodes and gate lines, gate insulation film, a semiconductor layer, source and drain electrodes, data lines, organic insulation film, and a pixel electrode, whereas the apparatus pertains to a data driver supplying a video signal to the liquid crystal cells and shifting the video signal by one channel.
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/664,972 Page 3

Art Unit: 2675

4. A telephone call was made to Valerie Hayes on Feb 22, 2006 to request an oral election

to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an

election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37

CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve

a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and

specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated

as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably

distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the

inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In

either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the

evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

AMR A. AWAD PRIMARY EXA<del>MINE</del>

Am Ahmed Ama